UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/853,722	05/14/2001	Timothy Russell Klos	P20422	6623

7055   7590   02/04/2004

GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE
RESTON, VA 20191

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, TOAN D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2665	

DATE MAILED: 02/04/2004

11

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>12 November 2003</u> .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-38</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-38</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
           application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .	6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

2.   This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the

claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various

claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any

evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out

the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c)

and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3.   Claims 1-7, 18-19, 22-23 and 31-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Sundaresan et al. (U.S. Patent 6,463,079 B2) further in view of Davis (U.S.

Patent 6,636,525 B1).

For claim 1, Sundaresan et al. disclose processing orders for high bandwidth connections

comprising:

receiving a service order requesting implementation of the DSL service, the service order

comprising provisioning data (figure 9, col. 15 lines 55-65 and col. 16 lines 27-34);

assigning a plurality of facilities to implement the service order based on the provisioning

data (col. 5 lines 21-30), the plurality of facilities comprising at least a remote terminal

connectable to a terminal of the DSL subscriber (col. 15 line 66 to col. 16 line 5 and col. 16 lines 57-67); and

configuring each of the plurality of facilities, using the corresponding interface, to implement the service order based on the provision data (col. 18 lines 32-62).

However, Sundaresan et al. do not disclose determining an interface corresponding to each of the plurality of facilities, each interface converting at least a portion of the provisioning data into a specific protocol corresponding to the assigned facility. In an analogous art, Davis discloses determining an interface corresponding to each of the plurality of facilities, each interface converting at least a portion of the provisioning data into a specific protocol corresponding to the assigned facility (figure 3, col. 5 lines 31-51).

One skilled in the art would have recognized an interface corresponding to each of the plurality of facilities to use the teachings of Davis in the system of Sundaresan et al. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to use the interface corresponding to each of the plurality of facilities as taught by Davis in Sundaresan et al.'s system with the motivation being to provide a shared access ADSL modem (col. 5 lines 19-20).

For claim 2, Sundaresan et al. disclose determining at least one path interconnecting the plurality of facilities and a subscriber port of the remote terminal, the subscriber port being configured to connect with the DSL subscriber terminal (figure 19, col. 29 lines 3-19).

For claim 3, Sundaresan et al. disclose determining and implementing a cross-connection in at least one of the plurality of facilities to enable the at least one path interconnecting the plurality of facilities and the subscriber port (figure 19, col. 29 lines 3-19).

For claim 4, Sundaresan et al. disclose storing configuration data in a system database, the configuration data comprising data identifying the plurality of facilities assigned to implement the service order, the at least one path interconnecting the plurality of facilities and the subscriber port of the remote terminal, and the cross-connection in the at least one of the plurality of facilities (figure 19, col. 29 lines 3-19).

For claim 5, Sundaresan et al. disclose wherein the provisioning data is derived based on the provisioning data indication in the service order (col. 2 lines 35-47).

For claim 6, Sundaresan et al. disclose wherein the service order indicates the provisioning data by at least one of providing the provisioning data and providing a profile identification that corresponds to parameters that define the DSL service (figure 9, col. 15 lines 55-65).

For claim 7, Sundaresan et al. disclose determining whether the service order comprises erroneous data; and when the service order is determined to comprise erroneous data, displaying at a graphical user interface an error message, which identifies the erroneous data, and receiving input from the graphical user interface to correct the erroneous data (figures 15 and 16, col. 23 lines 1-9 and col. 23 line 26 to col. 24 line 55).

For claim 18, Sundaresan et al. disclose processing orders for high bandwidth connections comprising:

a server that receives a service order for implementing the DSL service (figure 9, col. 15 lines 55-65 and col. 16 lines 27-34);

a plurality of network facilities connectable to the server (col. 5 lines 21-30); and

a system database that stores the service order (col. 20 lines 34-35) and a plurality of

interfaces identifiers for interfaces corresponding to the plurality of network facilities (figure 7A,

col. 9 lines 44-60);

wherein the server assigns provisioning facilities from among the plurality of network

facilities needed to implement the service order (col. 5 lines 21-30), the provisioning facilities

comprising at least one remote terminal, connectable to a terminal of a subscriber of the DSL

service (col. 15 line 66 to col. 16 line 5 and col. 16 lines 57-67); and

wherein the server directs configuration of each of the provisioning facilities, using at

least one of the interface identifiers retrieved from the system database corresponding to each of

the provisioning facilities, to implement the DSL service based on the service order (col. 18 lines

32-62).

However, Sundaresan et al. do not disclose using at least one of the interface identifiers

retrieved from the system database corresponding to each of the provisioning facilities, to

implement the DSL service based on the service order. In an analogous art, Davis in view of

Sundaresan et al. discloses using at least one of the interface identifiers retrieved from the system

database corresponding to each of the provisioning facilities, to implement the DSL service

based on the service order (figure 3, col. 5 lines 31-51).

One skilled in the art would have recognized using at least one of the interface identifiers

retrieved from the system database corresponding to each of the provisioning facilities, to

implement the DSL service based on the service order to use the teachings of Davis in the system

of Sundaresan et al. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of the invention, to use the at least one of the interface identifiers retrieved from the

system database corresponding to each of the provisioning facilities, to implement the DSL

service based on the service order as taught by Davis in Sundaresan et al.'s system with the

motivation being to provide a shared access ADSL modem (col. 5 lines 19-20).

For claim 19, Sundaresan et al. disclose the remote terminal comprising a subscriber port,

the subscriber port being configured to connect with a DSL subscriber terminal, wherein the

server enables at least one path interconnecting the plurality of facilities and the subscriber port

of the remote terminal (figure 19, col. 29 lines 3-19).

For claim 22, Sundaresan et al. disclose a graphical user interface connected to the server

and configured to interface with the server, the system database and at least one of the plurality

of network elements (figure 5, col. 8 lines 5-26).

For claim 23, Sundaresan et al. disclose when the service order comprises erroneous data,

the graphical user interface displays an error message, which identifies the erroneous data, and

receives input from an operator in response to the erroneous data (figures 15 and 16, col. 23 lines

1-9 and col. 23 line 26 to col. 24 line 55).

For claim 31, Sundaresan et al. disclose processing orders for high bandwidth

connections comprising:

a receiving source code segment that receives a service order requesting the DSL service

(figure 9, col. 15 lines 55-65 and col. 16 lines 27-34);

an assigning source code segment that assigns a plurality of facilities needed to

implement the service order based on provisioning data indicated by the service order (col. 5

lines 21-30), the plurality of facilities comprising at least a remote terminal connectable t a

terminal of a DSL subscriber and an optical concentrator device connect le to the remote

terminal (col. 15 line 66 to col. 16 line 5 and col. 16 lines 57-67); and

a configuring source code segment that configures each of the plurality of facilities, using

the corresponding interface, to implement the service order based on instructions from a

provisioning server (col. 18 lines 32-62).

Sundaresan et al. do not disclose a determining source code segment that determines an

interface corresponding to each of the plurality of facilities, each interface converting the service

order data into a specific protocol corresponding to the assigned facility. In an analogous art,

Davis discloses a determining source code segment that determines an interface corresponding to

each of the plurality of facilities, each interface converting the service order data into a specific

protocol corresponding to the assigned facility (figure 3, col. 5 lines 31-51).

One skilled in the art would have recognized a determining source code segment that

determines an interface corresponding to each of the plurality of facilities, each interface

converting the service order data into a specific protocol corresponding to the assigned facility

to use the teachings of Davis in the system of Sundaresan et al. Therefore, it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to use the determining

source code segment that determines an interface corresponding to each of the plurality of

facilities, each interface converting the service order data into a specific protocol corresponding

to the assigned facility as taught by Davis in Sundaresan et al.'s system with the motivation

being to provide a shared access ADSL modem (col. 5 lines 19-20).

For claim 32, Sundaresan et al. disclose a path determining source code segment that

determines at least one path interconnecting the plurality of facilities and a subscriber port of the

remote terminal, the subscriber port being configured to connect with the DSL subscriber

terminal (figure 19, col. 29 lines 3-19).

For claim 33, Sundaresan et al. disclose a cross-section determining source code segment

that determines and implements a cross-connection in at least one of the plurality of facilities to

enable the at least one path interconnecting the plurality of facilities and the subscriber port

(figure 19, col. 29 lines 3-19).

For claim 34, Sundaresan et al. disclose a memory source code segment that stores

configuration data in a system database, the configuration data comprising data identifying the

plurality of facilities assigned to implement the service order, the at least one path

interconnecting the plurality of facilities and the subscriber port of the remote terminal, and the

cross-connection in the at least one of the plurality of facilities (figure 19, col. 29 lines 3-19).

For claim 35, Sundaresan et al. disclose wherein the provisioning data is derived based on

the provisioning data indication in the service order (col. 2 lines 35-47).

For claim 36, Sundaresan et al. disclose wherein the service order indicates the

provisioning data by at least one of providing the provisioning data and providing a profile

identification that corresponds to parameters that define the DSL service (figure 9, col. 15 lines

55-65).

For claim 37, Sundaresan et al. disclose an error detection source code segment that

determines whether the service order comprises erroneous data and, when the service order is

determined to comprise erroneous data, initiates display at a graphical user interface of an error

message, which identifies the erroneous data, and receives input from the graphical user interface

to correct the erroneous data (figures 15 and 16, col. 23 lines 1-9 and col. 23 line 26 to col. 24

line 55).

4.   Claims 8-17, 20-21, 24-30 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Sundaresan et al. (U.S. Patent 6,463,079 B2) in view of Davis (U.S. Patent

6,636,525 B1) further in view of Byers (U.S. patent 5,926,472).

For claims 8, 12-14, 20 and 27-29, Sundaresan et al. disclose processing orders for high

bandwidth connections comprising:

receiving a service order at a common server, requesting set up of the DSL service (figure

9, col. 15 lines 55-65 and col. 16 lines 27-34);

converting the service order into provisionable steps (col. 16 lines 27-67 and col. 18 lines

1-24);

determining facility assignment data related to each of a plurality of facilities needed to

implement the provisionable steps (col. 5 lines 21-30), the facility assignment data comprising

identification of at least a remote terminal and a subscriber port, connectable to a terminal of the

DSL subscriber (figure 19, col. 29 lines 3-19); and

configuring each of the plurality of facilities to implement the service order based on

instructions communicated from the common server to each of the plurality of facilities using the

corresponding interface (col. 18 lines 32-62).

Sundaresan et al. do not disclose determining an interface for each of the plurality of

facilities, each interface enabling communication with the corresponding one of the plurality of

facilities. In an analogous art, Davis discloses determining an interface corresponding to each of

the plurality of facilities, each interface converting at least a portion of the provisioning data into a specific protocol corresponding to the assigned facility (figure 3, col. 5 lines 31-51).

One skilled in the art would have recognized an interface corresponding to each of the plurality of facilities to use the teachings of Davis in the system of Sundaresan et al. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to use the interface corresponding to each of the plurality of facilities as taught by Davis in Sundaresan et al.'s system with the motivation being to provide a shared access ADSL modem (col. 5 lines 19-20).

However, Sundaresan et al. in view of Davis do not disclose an optical concentrator device connectable to the remote terminal. In an analogous art, Byers discloses an optical concentrator device connectable to the remote terminal (col. 1 lines 43-45). Sundaresan et al. in view of Davis and Byers further disclose the configuring each of the plurality of facilities to implement the service order comprising one of building, deleting or changing at least one virtual path over an optical fiber connection between the remote terminal and the optical concentrator device (col. 29 lines 54-60 as set forth in claims 12 and 27); providing a network-side port at the remote terminal configured to connect with the subscriber port; communicating to the optical concentrator device the identity of the network-side port; and configuring the optical concentrator device to support the virtual path to the network-side port of the remote terminal (figure 19, col. 28 line 66 to col. 29 line 39 as set forth in claims 13-14 and 28-29); wherein the at least one of the remote terminal and the optical concentrator device determine and implement a cross-connection to enable the at least one path interconnecting the plurality of facilities and the subscriber port (figure 19, col. 28 line 66 to col. 29 line 39 as set forth in claim 20).

One skilled in the art would have recognized an optical concentrator device connectable to the remote terminal to use the teaching of Byers in the system of Sundaresan et al. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention, to use the optical concentrator device connectable to the remote terminal as taught by Byers in Sundaresan et al. with the motivation being to provide less expensive loops than copper loops by converting switch interfaces to fiber and back to copper at the remote terminal and consist of an optical remote terminal that interfaces with the optical links from the switching system (col. 1 lines 48-52).

For claim 9, Sundaresan et al. disclose formatting data from the service order into a common internal format prior to converting the service order into provisional steps (col. 18 lines 49-53).

For claim 10, Sundaresan et al. disclose validating an intent of the service order with respect to a state of a port of the remote terminal associated with the DSL subscriber and provisioning the service order in the remote terminal upon successful validation (figure 19, col. 28 line 66 to col. 29 line 46).

For claim 11, Sundaresan et al. disclose identifying errors related to at least one of the service order and the provisioning of the DSL service; and displaying information regarding the errors at a graphical user interface, the graphical user interface being configured to enable a user to analyze and respond to the errors (figures 15 and 16, col. 23 lines 1-9 and col. 23 line 26 to col. 24 line 55).

For claim 15, Sundaresan et al. disclose the configuring each of the plurality of facilities to implement the service order comprising one of building, deleting or changing at least one cross-connection in at least one of the plurality of facilities (col. 20 lines 34-35).

For claim 16, Sundaresan et al. disclose enqueuing the provisionable steps after determining the facility assignment data related to each of a plurality of facilities needed to implement the provisionable steps; and sequentially dequeuing the provisionable steps for implementation on a scheduled provisioning date, prior to determining the interface for each of the plurality of facilities (col. 20 lines 26-49).

For claim 17, Sundaresan et al. disclose receiving service profile data related to at least one service from a service provider, the service profile data comprising at least one parameter related to the service order; storing the service profile data in a system database; and configuring each of the plurality of facilities to implement the service order additionally based on the service profile data (col. 19 lines 14-51 and col. 20 lines 26-35).

For claim 21, Sundaresan et al. disclose the system database comprising configuration data that identifies the plurality of facilities assigned to implement the service order, the at least one path interconnecting the plurality of facilities and the subscriber port of the remote terminal, and the cross-connection in the at least one of the plurality of facilities (col. 20 lines 34-35).

For claims 24 and 30, Sundaresan et al. disclose processing orders for high bandwidth connections comprising:

a service order entry system that receives a service order for the DSL service from a DSL service provider (figure 9, col. 5 lines 46-65, col. 15 lines 55-65 and col. 16 lines 27-34);

a server that receives the service order from the service order entry system (col. 16 lines 27-34);

a plurality of network facilities connectable to the server and a terminal of a subscriber of the DSL service (figure 19, col. 29 lines 3-19);

a facility inventory system connected to the server that stores facility information regarding each of a plurality of network facilities, the facility information comprising a type, a location and an availability of each of the plurality of network facilities (figure 7A, col. 9 lines 45-60); and

a system database connected to a server that stores data relating to the service order and a plurality of interfaces corresponding to the plurality of network facilities (figure 7A, col. 9 lines 45-60 and col. 20 lines 34-35);

wherein the server communicates with the facility inventory system to determine provisioning facilities from among the plurality of network facilities needed to implement the DSL service based on order (col. 19 lines 9-46 and col. 20 lines 26-35), the provisioning facilities comprising at leas one remote terminal having a subscriber port (figure 19, col. 29 lines 3-19).

Sundaresan et al. do not disclose wherein the server directs configuration of each of the provisioning facilities using a corresponding one of the plurality of interfaces retrieved from the system database to implement the DSL service. In an analogous art, Davis in view of Sundaresan et al. discloses wherein the server directs configuration of each of the provisioning facilities using a corresponding one of the plurality of interfaces retrieved from the system database to implement the DSL service (figure 3, col. 5 lines 31-51).

One skilled in the art would have recognized the server directs configuration of each of the provisioning facilities using a corresponding one of the plurality of interfaces retrieved from the system database to implement the DSL service to use the teachings of Davis in the system of Sundaresan et al. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to use the server directs configuration of each of the provisioning facilities using a corresponding one of the plurality of interfaces retrieved from the system database to implement the DSL service as taught by Davis in Sundaresan et al.'s system with the motivation being to provide a shared access ADSL modem (col. 5 lines 19-20).

However, Sundaresan et al. in view of Davis do not disclose at least one optical concentrator device, the remote terminal being connectable to the optical concentrator device via an optical fiber line. In an analogous art, Byers discloses at least one optical concentrator device, the remote terminal being connectable to the optical concentrator device via an optical fiber line (col. 1 lines 43-45). One skilled in the art would have recognized an optical concentrator device connectable to the remote terminal to use the teaching of Byers in the system of Sundaresan et al. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention, to use the optical concentrator device connectable to the remote terminal as taught by Byers in Sundaresan et al. with the motivation being to provide less expensive loops than copper loops by converting switch interfaces to fiber and back to copper at the remote terminal and consist of an optical remote terminal that interfaces with the optical links from the switching system (col. 1 lines 48-52).

For claim 25, Sundaresan et al. disclose a graphical user interface connectable to the server that enables interaction by a network operator with at least one of the server, the plurality of network facilities and the system database (figure 5, col. 8 lines 5-26).

For claim 26, Sundaresan et al. disclose wherein the server identifies errors related to at least one of the service order and the provisioning of the DSL service; and wherein information regarding the errors is displayed at the graphical user interface and error responses are sent from the graphical user interface to the server (figures 15 and 16, col. 23 lines 1-9 and col. 23 line 26 to col. 24 line 55).

For claim 38, Sundaresan et al. disclose processing orders for high bandwidth connections comprising:

a receiving source code segment that receives a service order at a common server via a service order entry system, the service order corresponding to a DSL subscriber (figure 9, col. 15 lines 55-65 and col. 16 lines 27-34);

a converting source code segment that converts the service order into provisionab steps (col. 16 lines 27-67 and col. 18 lines 1-24);

a facility assignment source code segment that determines facility assignment data related to each of a plurality of facilities needed to implement the provisionable steps (col. 5 lines 21-30), the facility assignment data comprising identification of at least a remote terminal and a subscriber port, connectable to a terminal of the DSL subscriber, a an optical concentrator device connectable to the remote terminal (figure 19, col. 29 lines 3-19); and

a configuring source code segment that configures each of the plurality of facilities to

implement the service order based on instructions communicated from the common server to

each of he plurality of facilities using the corresponding interface (col. 18 lines 32-62).

Sundaresan et al. do not disclose an interface determining source code segment that

determines an interface for each of the plurality of facilities, each interface enabling

communication with the corresponding one of the plurality of facilities. In an analogous art,

Davis discloses an interface determining source code segment that determines an interface for

each of the plurality of facilities, each interface enabling communication with the corresponding

one of the plurality of facilities (figure 3, col. 5 lines 31-51).

One skilled in the art would have recognized an interface determining source code

segment that determines an interface for each of the plurality of facilities, each interface enabling

communication with the corresponding one of the plurality of facilities to use the teachings of

Davis in the system of Sundaresan et al. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to use the an interface determining source

code segment that determines an interface for each of the plurality of facilities, each interface

enabling communication with the corresponding one of the plurality of facilities as taught by

Davis in Sundaresan et al.'s system with the motivation being to provide a shared access ADSL

modem (col. 5 lines 19-20).

However, Sundaresan et al. in view of Davis do not disclose an optical concentrator

device connectable to the remote terminal. In an analogous art, Byers discloses an optical

concentrator device connectable to the remote terminal (col. 1 lines 43-45). One skilled in the art

would have recognized an optical concentrator device connectable to the remote terminal to use

the teaching of Byers in the system of Sundaresan et al. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention, to use the optical concentrator device connectable to the remote terminal as taught by Byers in Sundaresan et al. with the motivation being to provide less expensive loops than copper loops by converting switch interfaces to fiber and back to copper at the remote terminal and consist of an optical remote terminal that interfaces with the optical links from the switching system (col. 1 lines 48-52).

Response to Arguments

5.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-38 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Contact Information

6.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Toan D Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-0140. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday (7:00AM-4:30PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Huy Vu can be reached on 703-308-6602. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-9600.

Toan D. Nguyen